



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/760,236	01/12/2001	William T. Daniell	10004555-1	2557

22879 7590 05/03/2005

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

LAFORGIA, CHRISTIAN A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2131

DATE MAILED: 05/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/760,236

Applicant(s)

DANIELL ET AL.

Examiner

Christian La Forgia

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 November 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. The amendment filed on 19 November 2004 has been noted and made of record.
2. Claims 1-19 have been presented for examination.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
4. See further rejections that follow.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-14, 16, 17, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,339,826 to Hayes, Jr. et al, hereinafter Hayes, in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,720,033 to Deo, hereinafter Deo.

7. As per claims 1, 5, and 9, Hayes teaches a display device having a screen for displaying images (Fig 1); and

a security application defining a list of security rules for locking down resources of said computer system (column 19, Lines 50-55), said security application configured to categorize said rules into a plurality of categories (column 19, lines 55-67) and to display at least one of said categories on said screen (Fig 17), said security application configured to determine which of said rules are associated with said one category in response to a selection of said one category

Art Unit: 2131

by a user of said computer system (column 19, lines 57-60), said security application configured to display on said screen each of said rules associated with said one category in response to said selection (column 19, lines 60-62), said security application further configured to allow said user to enable ones of said rules and to cause said computer system to enforce said enabled ones of said rules by modifying a machine state of said computer system (column 20, lines 1-5).

8. Hayes does not disclose wherein different ones of said categories respectively pertain to different ones of a plurality of applications and wherein said rules are categorized such that said one category is assigned only to ones of said rules that affect a particular application pertaining to said one category.

9. Deo teaches associating security rules with particular applications (column 2, lines 43-67, i.e. entity type – the basic object type that will be used to define a security feature for a particular application).

10. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made wherein different ones of said categories respectively pertain to different ones of a plurality of applications and wherein said rules are categorized such that said one category is assigned only to ones of said rules that affect a particular application pertaining to said one category, since Deo states at column 2, lines 43-49 that such a modification would provide a security platform adaptable to a variety of applications, provide a uniform system-wide security capability thereby making the system more secure, and allows the implementation and modification of security measures quickly and easily.

Art Unit: 2131

11. Regarding claims 2, 6, and 10, Hayes teaches memory storing various computer applications (column 18, lines 35-36), and wherein said security application is further configured to determine which computer applications are stored in said memory and to display said categories based On a determination by said security application as to which computer applications are stored in said memory (column 18, lines 43-45).

12. Regarding claims 3, 7, and 11, Hayes teaches one category is displayed on said screen by said security application in response to a selection of another category by said user (column 18, lines 27-30).

13. Regarding claims 4, 8, and 12, Hayes teaches one category is a sub-category of another of said categories (column 18, lines 27-30).

14. Regarding claims 13 and 16, Deo discloses wherein each of said rules is assigned to a respective one of said categories based on whether said each rule controls access to an application pertaining to said respective one category (Abstract, column 3, line 65 to column 4, line 7).

15. Regarding claim 14, Deo teaches wherein each of said categories is assigned only to ones of said security rules that affect a respective one of said applications pertaining to said each category (column 7, lines 37-60).

Art Unit: 2131

16. Regarding claim 17, Deo discloses wherein each of said categories pertains to only a respective one of said applications (column 2, lines 43-67).

17. Regarding claim 19, Deo discloses making said selection in response to a determination that said one category pertaining to said particular application (column 2, lines 43-67).

18. Claims 15 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayes in view of Deo as applied above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,587,836 to Ahlberg et al., hereinafter Ahlberg.

19. Regarding claim 15, Hayes and Deo do not disclose wherein said security application, in response to a selection of one of said rules, is configured to display help information pertaining to said one rule.

20. Ahlberg teaches wherein said security application, in response to a selection of one of said rules, is configured to display help information pertaining to said one rule (column 15, lines 18-33).

21. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to display help information, since it is commonly known in the art that help menus provide assistance in implementing certain features.

22. Regarding claim 18, Deo teaches selecting one of said rules (column 3, line 65 to column 4, line 7).

Art Unit: 2131

23. Hayes and Deo do not teach displaying help information pertaining to said one rule in response to said selecting.

24. Ahlberg discloses displaying help information pertaining to said one rule in response to said selecting (column 15, lines 18-33).

25. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to display help information, since it is commonly known in the art that help menus provide assistance in implementing certain features.

Conclusion

26. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

27. The following patents are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to application related security, such as:

United States Patent No. 6,721,890 to Shrikhande, which is cited to show application specific distributed firewall.

United States Patent No. 5,826,268 to Schaefer et al., which is cited to show secure multilevel object oriented database management system.

United States Patent No. 6,789,112 to Freeman et al., which is cited to show grouping security rules together that are related to an application.

United States Patent No. 6,418,416 to Rosenberg et al., which is cited to show grouping security rules together that are related to an application.

Art Unit: 2131

28. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

29. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

30. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christian La Forgia whose telephone number is (571) 272-3792. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Thursday 7-5.


31. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2131

32. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Christian LaForgia
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2131

clf


AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100